

b) at least one higher level log and at least one status log.

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under Section 35 USC 112, second paragraph, wherein the rejection asserts that the claims fail to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner asserts essentially that the preamble and the later claim limitations are unclear and fail to establish the relation to “triggering commands in response to receipt of status logs” (Claims 1 and 4). Applicant is uncertain as to why the Examiner finds this unclear. The claims clearly specify the relationship between the status logs and the higher level logs, followed by the relationship between the higher level logs and the execution sets of commands in association with predetermined ones of said higher level logs. As such, one skilled in the art would have no difficulty understanding how the status logs ultimately impact upon the triggering of commands. The claims are believed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Cuddihy et al. (USPN 5,463,768) and Noble et al. (USPN 5,944,782). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Cuddihy and Noble teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 1-7.

Claims 1 and 4 are the independent claims.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, “means for receiving said status logs and generating higher level logs in response to receipt of at least two different status logs which satisfy predetermined rule sets; a user interface for programming execution sets of commands in association with predetermined ones of said higher level logs.” Claim 4 claims, *inter alia*, “providing rule sets that are satisfied by receipt of particular combinations of at least two different status logs and when satisfied, result in the generation of higher level logs; programming execution sets of said commands in association with predetermined ones of said higher level logs.”

Cuddihy relates generally to the diagnostics of machine malfunctions and more particularly to the automated derivation of repair recommendations through analysis of error logs generated from malfunctioning machines (see Abstract). The error logs are grouped into case sets of common symptoms or common corrective actions (see col. 4, lines 32-36). The error logs within the cases and case sets are then examined to identify common patterns of data, the common patterns being labeled as blocks (see col. 4, lines 44-47). The Examiner asserts that the cases in Cuddihy are analogous to the higher level logs of the claimed invention.

The Examiner concedes that Cuddihy fails to teach the triggering of commands in response to receipt of logs, a user interface for programming execution sets and triggering execution of said commands in said execution sets.

The Examiner turns to Noble, asserting essentially that Noble teaches the means to automatically generate corrective action execution. Noble relates generally to administering computer networks and relates more particularly to a system for managing selected events which occur in a plurality of computers within a computer network (see Abstract).

At no point do Cuddihy or Noble, taken either alone or in combination teach or suggest that “execution sets of commands in association with predetermined ones of said higher level


logs,” as clearly specified in independent Claims 1 and 4. Nobel specifies at col. 2, lines 22-25, that a “corrective action required by a given alarm can be carried out in many cases locally by the management agent.” This suggests that the “alarm” to which a corrective action is initiated is generated locally (i.e., to indicate disk space available; see col. 2, lines 16-17) and therefore is analogous to the status logs, not the higher level logs. In the claimed invention, execution of commands is connected with higher level logs that are generated from the status logs in response to predetermined rule sets being satisfied. There is no suggestion in either reference that execution sets of commands are being associated with any sort of higher level log. As such, it is believed that independent Claims 1 and 4, as well as the respective dependent claims fully distinguish over the cited references.

The combined teachings of Cuddihy and Noble fail to teach or suggest “execution sets of commands in association with predetermined ones of said higher level logs,” as claimed in Claims 1 and 7. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 1-7, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Dated: February 26, 2007

**F. Chau & Associates, LLC**  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889

Respectfully submitted,  
By:   
Nathaniel T. Wallace  
Reg. No. 48,909  
Attorney for Applicant(s)